THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

That the present war marks an epoch, all thinking persons realize. The old order is dead; and a new order of some kind must be established, not only among the nations, but within the nation. Amid the distractions of actual war which threatens our very existence it is not easy for all to ponder on post-war problems; but it is well that many can, and are busy on the task. All such will be greatly helped to clarity of thought by a striking volume, *The Social Gospel Re-examined*, by Mr. F. Ernest Johnson (James Clarke; 8s. 6d. net).

Mr. Johnson did not design his book for the purpose mentioned. It was written before America entered the war. It is meant just to answer in the negative the question—Is the Social Gospel out of date?

Mr. Johnson writes as an American and primarily for American Christians. Some paragraphs require in consequence some discount in the minds of British readers, but such discounts are few and of no great importance.

The so-called 'Social Gospel' was preached here, though not to the same extent, nor with the same one-sided exaggeration as in America. It has recently been under a cloud here, just as it has been across the Atlantic, and, broadly speaking, for much the same reasons. We should not indeed attach the same weight to the influence of 'fundamentalism' as is true for America, because that creed has not been influential among us in anything like the same degree.

Probably 'disillusionment' has been the biggest factor common to both countries. The Social Gospel as it was proclaimed by some was too facile, and too sure of itself. Hopes were placed too high on this or that social change; the legislation was passed; but the consequences were disappointing. A change, desirable in itself, had been made; but the world was still not the Kingdom of God.

Mr. Johnson quotes as typical a confession by a young minister: 'I graduated just when my seminary was at the peak of its social passion. I have been preaching seven years. I still believe in all the things I believed when I graduated. But I must admit that the message about Society is not enough. Somehow my preaching is getting thin. I want to find a way in which I can maintain all this enthusiasm for a better Society, and yet possess something which will give energy and power to my preaching.'

It is the conviction of our author that all that was good in the Social Gospel can be retained, and must be retained, for 'a vigorous social ethic is vital to orthodoxy'; but 'liberal social Christianity needs to rediscover its roots in the historic Christian faith.'

If the Church is to survive she must have a distinctive message. A simple enunciation of belief in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man will not do, because that creed is not distinctively Christian. If the Church be no more, and have no more to proclaim to a needy world than an ethical society, there is no place, indeed no need, for her continued existence. 'Christianity has one central truth, one abiding contribution to the religious life of the world and only one. That contribution is Jesus Christ Himself. The Gospel *is* Jesus Christ.' As soon as this is realized, the social and ethical side of the gospel is obvious. 'For Jesus' life is for Christians the demonstration *par excellence* of what goodness in human relations means. There is a social gospel only because the personality of Jesus makes such a terrific impact on the whole order of human relationships, and because its demands can never be met without a thorough re-organization of human affairs. His ethical challenge to the individual is so forceful as to satisfy the most rugged realism of the current orthodoxy. His challenge to Society has inspired in every succeeding age revolutionary efforts to remake the world.' Yet the true, as distinguished from a defective social, gospel will never allow the revolutionary social implications of the teaching and example of Jesus to eclipse the need for individual discipleship.

One of the really disastrous happenings in modern times, since the Reformation in fact, has been the progressive secularization of culture. There can be no definite demarcation between 'secular' and 'sacred.' Christianity is irrelevant to no human relationship or activity. The Church must proclaim that so convincingly that people will really believe it, and take it in earnest. It is no true Christianity which holds that the world is the devil's and the gospel offers deliverance of men out of the world. The world in which we live at present must be 'saved,' by being permeated with the spirit of Christ. That is a long, indeed an unending, task. Would we really have it otherwise?

Under the title, *A Creed for Free Men* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), Dr. William Adams Brown has published a topical book. It is a defence, in view of the present political crisis, of the democrat's faith and loyalty. The scope of the work is indicated by the titles of its four chapters; the democratic alternative to world chaos; how the Christian's faith reinforces the democrat's loyalty; the democrat's creed tested by life; what the Church alone can supply.

One cannot but admire the alertness and vigour of mind shown in these pages by a theologian who for forty years has been of great influence, through his personality and writings, in the English-speaking world, and more especially in America and Britain. If there is any point of criticism we should desire to make after perusal of this volume, it would be its tendency—difficult certainly to avoid in such a theme—to rest upon a generalized form of exposition.

The exposition begins with a citation and endorsement of Gilbert Murray's statement: 'The essential doctrine of democracy is that each man, as a free human soul, lives of his own free will in the service of the whole people.' It is an excellent statement of the democratic ideal. The difficulty is how to realize that ideal in the national order, and in the international order too.

For Dr. Adams Brown, like so many writers at the present juncture, looks hopefully beyond the nation to an international social order in which there shall be social peace and security. He is of opinion that the real cause of the failure of the League of Nations was the lack of an 'international consciousness.' Men will fight for power, honour, freedom, or justice, he says, but they are not yet ready to fight for a stable order of society upon the earth.

On what can we base the hope of such an order? The answer is a familiar one to-day, even to other than theological circles. Here is how our author expresses it: 'In its central doctrine of a personal God who has endowed men with freedom and summons them to brotherhood Christianity provides a religious basis for a fellowship of the democratic type better than any other existing religion.'

He does not, however, claim that Christianity offers a panacea for social ills. He is content to affirm the widely supported position, that Christian principles provide 'a key to the understanding of human problems which, if it cannot itself furnish the right solution, may at least create the spirit through which alone there is hope of finding it.'

It is part of the strength of Christianity in this reference that the Christian Church alone among human institutions has taken the ideal of a world society seriously. And the Church's witness to that ideal will be more effective when it can confront the world as itself a truly unitary institution. But if the Church is to secure for itself the form of unity which is most congenial to the democratic ideal, it must make larger use of the principle of federation. In saying all this Dr. William Adams Brown is but repeating what he has said for many years at the great Church Conferences.

Our hope for the world, he concludes, is an inclusive religious fellowship, the fellowship of men of goodwill in every land and age, that invisible Church which Josiah Royce called 'The Beloved Community,' and which is incarnate in the Church visible.

'The Beloved Community is a fact. It is here, and we are part of it. To witness to this fact in season and out of season; to give it our supreme loyalty at any cost, to work with every means in our power to give it a more perfect embodiment in each of the institutions to which we belong, family, and neighbourhood, and school, and State, and Church, this is our privilege and responsibility both as democrats and as Christians.'

Some little time ago the Rev. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, the associate minister of Westminster Chapel, wrote a fresh and incisive treatment of the burning question, 'Why Does God Allow War?' He has now given us an equally valuable and timely discussion of *The Plight of Man and the Power of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net).

It takes the form of five lectures based on the early chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans in which he sets Biblical teaching in strong contrast to modern ideas and vigorously challenges along the whole line the modern view of man. Whether one agrees or not with the writer in all the points he makes, it cannot be denied that here is a topic of vital importance which urgently requires consideration. For obviously all attempts to extricate man from the desperate plight in which he now finds himself and to reconstruct a better social order will fail and come to nought, if they are based on a fundamental misconception of man in his origin, nature, and relations.

What is the modern view of man? In a word it is dominated by the concept of evolution which took possession of the popular mind in the latter half of the nineteenth century. A concept of respectable antiquity it took on a new lease of life when Darwin offered it as an explanation of the origin of species. From this comparatively modest beginning it set out to conquer the whole world of thought and, rapidly overrunning one province after another, it has become quite totalitarian, demanding and receiving in many quarters a blind and unquestioning acceptance. So completely obsessed have many minds become that they demand that everything in heaven and earth must be brought under this single category.

On the one hand its sway has been extended to the illimitable spaces of the inorganic world although so great an authority as Professor Soddy has said that 'it is a mere obsession to extend such ideas to the inanimate world,' and although all authorities in physics are agreed that the physical world, instead of evolving, is running down in accordance with the inexorable second law of thermodynamics. On the other hand, the evolutionary concept is extended to include the whole world of man, who is therefore to be regarded as indeed the fairest flower of evolution but nothing more.

Needless to say, this doctrine has the most serious consequences in religion and morality. Man is from beneath as the lower creatures are from beneath. He has come to be what he is by a process of natural development and by the inescapable law of natural development he will decay and perish. For his brief day he stands alone on the summit of existence with no higher Being above him, or if there be such a higher Being He is strangely debarred from revealing Himself to man. Religion is the product of man's upward striving and creative imagination. Morality has its root and sanction not in any divine will but in the accumulated experience of the race. Sin is an inevitable stage in the evolutionary process; in other words, good in the making, the relics of the brute from which man has not shaken himself quite free.

Now, strangely enough, though this view of man seems to imply an immense lowering of human dignity, it has in fact ministered to man's pride and sense of self-sufficiency. It has relieved him of the guilt of sin. Sin is no longer a thing to worry about, and modern man was proud to say that he had ceased to worry. It relieved him of the incubus of a divine law restraining his passions and governing his actions. He could now be a law unto himself. Above all, it placed him on the centre of the stage as the hero of the whole piece. By his blind but persistent strivings he has struggled up to his proud position at the very top of the evolutionary process. Nobody has ventured to suggest that there is anything heroic in the growth of a tadpole into a frog or the transformation of a reptile into a bird, but for some quite unexplained reason the evolution of an ape into a man is held to be a heroic achievement. And now, having reached this proud height, and having now at length by his own cleverness discovered the law of progress, modern man was preparing to take the whole going concern into his own hands and henceforth consciously guide the evolutionary process according to his own desires. Such was the optimistic view of modern man.

Then there befell this catastrophe of world-war in which we are now plunged, bringing upon mankind unparalleled miseries and chaos. The situation is immensely complicated and one must be cautious in judging and distributing blame. It is a well-known fallacy to argue *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. But it is surely most significant that just at the moment when man was proudest of his achievements his great tower of Babel has fallen in ruins about him; just when sin was lightly regarded and ignored it has risen up with demonic energy and broken loose upon the nations with unprecedented fury; just when man was hailing himself as 'the master of things' he has become their victim and their slave; just as he dreamed of controlling the world process he has lost control and is swept along on resistless tides of barbarism.

Now the cause of all this is not to be sought on the surface. There must be something fundamentally wrong, and it is for the Christian Church above all to search deeply into the matter. She

must search her own conscience as to her faithfulness to the gospel committed to her and to her share of responsibility for the present crisis. In her endeavour to convey her message to the modern mind has she sacrificed vital elements in that message and substituted ideas and thought-forms which are alien to it? Have her preachers spoken of man in terms of modern thought, as a heroic, aspiring creature, a natural son of God, to be hailed for his past achievements and cheered on his upward way? Have they, no doubt unintentionally, led him to think of his sins as growing pains, and sometimes given him dope to soothe his uneasy conscience?

If there be any truth in this then the crisis of to-day is a trumpet call to the Church to return to a fresh study of the Word of God, to find there a quite consistent and realistic view of man as a fallen being, with his great powers perverted, with the guilt of his sin upon his soul, yet capable of being by God's grace redeemed and glorified. Few Christians will deny that it is of vital importance to proclaim this Bible doctrine of man with all authority, and, if possible, to reinstate it as the guiding principle of human thought and action. Man must be taught to feel his dependence upon God, to acknowledge the authority of the divine law, to realize the guilt of his sin, to seek God's guidance and depend on God's mercy. Otherwise in his endeavours to reconstruct the world and bring in a new and better order he will be as all his fathers were, but a builder upon sand whose proudest work is doomed to fall.

Reconstruction Problems.

XI. The Practical Necessity of a Christian Sociology.

By the Reverend J. V. Langmead Casserley, B.A., Oxhey Vicarage, Watford.

This essay assumes that, as is and ought to be the case, the great majority of Christian ministers and laymen are primarily concerned with problems of an evangelistic and pastoral nature. The evangelistic problem may be roughly described as that of 'getting the outsider in.' The pastoral problem may be similarly described as that of 'getting the insider on.' Allowing that these are and must remain the primary pre-occupations of the Church, we shall go on to argue that a specifically Christian social doctrine and analysis is vital for their solution.

But first of all we must attempt a description of the Christian sociological viewpoint, or, better, a vindication of the claim of Christianity to be in its own right a sociological viewpoint, and one from which it is possible to witness a social panorama of unique breadth and clarity.

Christian sociology is one of the products of a theology in an extensive mood. Other products of this extensive mood are such phenomena as Christian literary and artistic criticism, Christian educational theory and any phase of Christian thought in which the Christianity is to be found in the categories and standards of judgment employed in the process rather than in the themes and objects posed for consideration.

In the better known, intensive mood of theology, it is the theme and object which is specifically Christian and the intellectual methods employed tend to be more or less identical with those which have proved fruitful in other realms of human discussion. In this primary mood theology is moved to a careful scrutiny of the data provided by the Christian revelation as a result of which it aims at producing a systematic statement of the content of the faith which will enable preachers and teachers of the Gospel to distinguish between an authentic proclamation of the objective Word of God and any merely personal, subjective and heretical, substitute for it. The intensive theologian is equipped for this scrutiny by the intellectual traditions and methods of his time. Thus, St. Paul employs a personal blend of Greek and Rabbinical dialectics in his statement of the Gospel, the Fathers use for the most part Hellenic or Latin post-Hellenic mental categories, and the contemporary Biblical critic utilises the historical and literary methods which have enjoyed so much success in other spheres. The temptation of the theologian in this necessary and primary mood is to accept the intellectual equipment provided for him by the prevailing cultural traditions with too little criticism. We are all prone to concentrate our attention upon what we are thinking about rather than upon the specific manner in which we are thinking. Thus the parrot cry of the contemporary Biblical critic, that he is right to use

in the interpretation of the Scriptures the methods which are currently and conventionally employed in the interpretation of all other historical documents, obscures the real issue, which is only raised when we ask the question whether these particular methods are the best which can be devised for the task of historical interpretation whether Scriptural or otherwise. In the modern world, with his faith vigorously assailed and his claim to a science of his own called in question, the intensive theologian has adopted on the whole a defensive attitude. His chief concern has been to vindicate the widely disputed existence of specifically theological data and to demonstrate that theology is a true science with a province of its own which may rightly take its place side by side with the other sciences. The characteristic products of theology in this intensive mood are the critical study and exposition of the Scriptures and the Credal and Liturgical documents of the Church, the doctrine of the being of God, the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the doctrines of the Church, the Sacraments and the Ministry. But even the most intensive theologian cannot refrain from moving on at some point to a doctrine of man. And here he commences to occupy a territory which he cannot pretend to be indisputably his own. There are other sciences which are also concerned with the study of man—history, sociology, economics, and psychology for example. Here at least the claim that theology is one science among others with a well-defined territory of its own must break down. Unless he is prepared to deny that history, sociology, economics, and psychology have any function to perform at all, the theologian will be compelled to relate his science to them in some new way. He is in fact driven back to the mediæval conception of theology as the 'Queen of the Sciences,' the shadow that shelters them all, the principle of their synthesis, the necessary philosophical background without which their findings cannot be rightly evaluated and interpreted. (Thus, the otherwise disconcerting and incredible psychoanalytic doctrines begin to make sense and to possess point and relevance when it is perceived that what they provide is a psychology of fallen man, tormented and enervated by the cross-purposes and internal divisions which are the fruit of his tragic, God-forsaking but not God-forsaken, condition.) At this point theology has reached the cross-roads. Although there can be valid observation and experiment, classification and description, of created objects without any consciousness of the inevitable theological background of all human activities (and this secures the relative independence and autonomy of the subject sciences), there can on the other hand be no valid interpretation which is not primarily and consciously theological interpretation. Here we can do no more than note in passing the fact that although the theologian is driven to this position by the necessity of relating his specifically theological doctrine of man to the various descriptions of phenomenal man provided by other intellectual disciplines, the solution to which he is driven, that of the Queen science on the one hand and the loyal but autonomous subject sciences on the other, is of much wider, indeed of universal, application. The general principle which arises is this: *There can be no valid doctrine or interpretation of a created being or thing, or of any series of created beings or things, which does not depart from and conclude with the all pervading creaturehood of the object of its study, for the true meaning of a creature is not in itself and is only disclosed in its relation to the Creator.*

He who would bear with the writer thus far will find that the intensive mood has vanished. A new world of possibilities is open to him: a Christian doctrine of nature (*i.e.* a critical interpretation of physical science), a Christian doctrine of number (*i.e.* a critical interpretation of mathematics—long overdue), a Christian literary and artistic criticism and, which is our immediate concern, a constructive Christian critique of contemporary social purposes, idealisms, and panaceas.

This expansive mood of theology is thus an aggressive and confident one. It is the mood of a theology which sallies forth to conquer, knowing that, in a world which has forgotten the art and principle of synthesis and in which culture is consequently falling to pieces, it can hardly fail. This is, I believe, the real implication of the current tendency to move from a human study (human, that is, in its intellectual methods) of the ultimate deposit of faith, the saving Acts and Words of God in history, to a theological critique (theological, that is, in its categories of thought and standards of judgment) of the humanities. There is no logical stopping place between the position which we now occupy and a new, twentieth century *Summa*, a task which has become of necessity of such vast proportions that its fulfilment will require not a single devoted man but a whole generation of theologians.

Christian sociology is thus a study of human history and social life in all its complexity which is dominated by the Christian doctrine of man—that is, by an interpretation of phenomenal man's condition of which the key words and phrases are 'the fall,' '*Imago Dei*,' '*Similitudo Dei*' and 'natural law' coupled with an insistence on noumenal man's supernatural destiny which finds expression in theological conceptions such as 'Revelation,' 'Redemption,' 'Heaven,' and the 'Vision of God.' It poses the question how, using

the skills, raw materials and opportunities available to contemporary man, is it possible to take an initiative in the present situation giving hope of such social, political, and economic conditions as will enable even fallen man to achieve a way of life which will reflect more adequately his true nature and conduce more effectively to his fulfilment of his destiny, a mirror-like society which will reflect the truth about man's being, a ladder-like society which will assist his passage from earth to heaven. We call it Christendom, a society in which there is a real and effective dominion of Christ despite the fact that men are sinners. It is very much less than the Kingdom of God, but it is very much more than the materialist Utopia of the humanitarian optimists.

In short, the Christian cannot but believe himself to know, in a unique manner and to a unique degree, the truth as to what man really is and what his earthly life is really for. He is in the best position to say how it is that unnatural ways of earthly life distort man's nature and estrange him from his destiny, how it is that such ways of life have calamitous earthly and material consequences and in what manner we may profitably seek to evolve out of any existing situation a social and personal discipline for human communities more correspondent to the revealed truth about man's being. Such an application of Christian dogma will base its appeal upon and derive its force from the capacity which it manifests to illuminate and handle the otherwise ineluctable and ungovernable problems of contemporary men.

In the shadow of these problems dwell the men and women to whom the Christian evangelist must somehow make his appeal. I do not mean to suggest that the great majority of living human beings are consciously obsessed with social and political problems, although this could be said of quite a considerable proportion of them with very little exaggeration. The truth lies much deeper than states of consciousness. Our lives are beset by chaotic political and economic conditions. Custom may blind us to the chaos but the fact remains that what comes to consciousness must filter through it. Whether or not the chaos itself invades the consciousness, it remains that whatever does succeed in emerging into the light is the upshot of the chaos. We live in a disintegrated society which pursues and permits itself to be moved by purposes which have no relation to the real elemental needs of the human being and very often no relation to each other. But the purposes so widely entertained and persisted with in a fallen society are apt to seem more real than the human lives and personalities which are squandered and exploited, which indeed often squander and exploit themselves, in the pursuit. It is not that the unrealities seem more real than the realities, because more efficacious, but rather that the unrealities have so completely masked the realities that the latter do not appear at all. The whole structure of the common life is shaped and dominated by desires which cannot be achieved and which would not satisfy if they could. The mass man's cult of Utopia, trader-man's desperate quest for a secure liquid profit, the politician's will to power, these are our modern vanities. The vanity of the preacher refers to that vast complex of things thought and spoken and done by men and women which lack the relationship with human nature and human destiny which alone could provide them with any real meaning.

The product of this complex of vanity is the man who has become so completely estranged from himself that he has lost all consciousness of his real personal predicament. Back in the middle of the last century F. D. Maurice noted with concern the decay of the capacity to ask the right questions, to ask the questions to which the Gospel has the answer. The melancholy process to which he drew our attention is now at a much later stage, and experience is making us increasingly conscious of the fact that much of our evangelical preaching fails because it consists for the most part of true and eloquent answers to questions which are not being asked, of solutions to real problems, indeed *the* real problems, but unfortunately not the problems of which men are conscious. What the evangelist requires is some new technique for restoring men to consciousness of themselves, of their true nature and destiny and tragic predicament. What he really needs is something which I should call a critique of the vanities. (Why is Ecclesiastes so little used in contemporary preaching? I have even heard an unusually shallow and optimistic university ecclesiastic openly lament the fact that this inspired commentary on the aimlessness of life in a fallen world has found its way into the Canon of Scripture!) The evangelistic function of this preliminary critique would be to assist the hearer to disentangle the reality of himself from the unreality of his social context. The hour in which a man discovers his own personal transcendence of the 'situation' is one of genuine rebirth, in a sociological as well as in an evangelical sense. The primary insistence of any Christian sociology is the affirmation that the social order is concerned with men, with their need to express the nature which God gave them and to fulfil the destiny which He set before them, and that it is not in the least concerned to further the half-baked purposes which they have devised for themselves.

Such an evangelistic technique as I have in

mind would assume therefore that modern man is tragically unconscious of himself. 'You do not know what you want,' it would say to him, 'You have defined your purposes in terms of Utopia, in terms of power politics, in terms of finance, in terms of mass prosperity and security, in terms of nationalism or cosmopolitanism as the case may be, or perhaps, in some time of the breaking of nations, you have merely clung pathetically to the wreck of your own private and personal life and wept because history would not let you go on being what you were or, rather, what you thought yourself to be. I have come to tell you,' our ideal preacher would continue, 'that such purposes are by nature incapable of fulfilment. They contradict the very laws of reality. More than that, I have come to tell you that if you could achieve these impossibilities, you would not like or enjoy what you had done. More even than that, the real you does not in fact desire these things. These pathetic aspirations do not come out of your true heart and mind, they are the upshot of a disordered social situation which has made you a stranger to yourself. But have no fear, you are more real than any social situation, for you were made by God whereas the social situation is made by man. Only discover yourself and harmonise your conscious wants with your real needs and there will be let loose in you and in the world a cohesive social purpose of a kind which the laws and structure of the creation will permit you to fulfil. Learn to want what your nature will permit you to enjoy and your condition will enable you to get. Such is the beginning of wisdom.'

From the foregoing it will be clear that Christian sociology in the modern world is largely preoccupied with the problem of social, that is of human, purposes. The modern world has proved itself capable and energetic in equipping itself with the means with which to pursue its ends. In its choice of ends, however, it has been almost imbecile. It is to Christian sociology, therefore, that we must look for the necessary critique of the prevailing social vanities, and for such an authoritative restatement of authentic human purposes as may guide us in redisposing and redirecting the instruments at our disposal.

But more surprising and more revealing than the frustration which we experience in our efforts to get 'the outsider in' is that which confronts us in our parallel efforts to get 'the insider on.' To the evangelist the world is the enemy, a terrible but at least an external foe. The pastor, on the other hand, knows the world as fifth columnist and saboteur. He experiences again and again the strange spiritual paralysis which so frequently overtakes even the most devout and sincere Christian people, usually at quite an elementary stage of the spiritual life. The passage of years will still find such people praying the same prayers, wrestling with the same doubts and temptations, and tormented by the same problems. Our congregations are full of devout people suffering from arrested spiritual development. What is the cause of this prevalent disease of the soul?

The masters of the spiritual life are substantially agreed that the first stage of such a life is that which aims at securing the conformity of our exterior and visible actions to the will of God. But such actions fall into three classes—those which are expressly forbidden, those which are directly commanded, and a large class of activities which are subject neither to any prohibition nor to any positive precept. Mr. Aldous Huxley concentrates our attention on this third class of actions in his interesting and provocative, if somewhat unreliable, book, *Grey Eminence* (Chatto & Windus). In regard to it he tells us that, 'What counts is the intention. For in matters indifferent, "the work accords with the intention, not the intention with the work." If, while doing an indifferent thing, we dedicate our action to God, the doing of it will actually be the will of God. To go for a walk or to eat one's dinner, consciously, for God's sake is better, so far as one's own soul is concerned, than the performance of intrinsically meritorious acts for one's own advantage. All this is good as far as it goes: but unfortunately it does not go far enough. Father Benet says nothing whatever about a whole class of acts which, so far as their earthly consequences are concerned, are more important than any others; I mean, those acts which the individual performs, not for his own sake, but on behalf and for the advantage of some social organization, such as a nation, a church, a political party, a religious order, a business concern, a family. There are no moral problems more difficult than those connected with this class of actions. All the more reason, then, that in a treatise on the practice of God's will they should be thoroughly examined' (p. 68). This is a most important passage. We are reminded of George Herbert's familiar lines:

> Who sweeps a room, as for Thy laws
> Makes that and th' action fine.

There is thus a real difference, even if it is only visible to God, between sweeping a room to the glory of God and merely sweeping a room. But unfortunately, as Huxley pointed out, our spiritual teachers have for too long ignored the fact that the social and economic routine of modern society incorporates many classes of actions which cannot in fact be carried out to the glory of God. Their radically unsanctifiable character is concealed by their familiarity and hence even devout people

may spend a lifetime vainly trying to offer, without any consciousness of the vanity of the process, activities which are so foreign to God's purpose for man and to our true nature that it is impossible for them to be accepted. As a result the spiritual lives of such persons are built upon a false foundation and cannot stand. What the pastor requires is a theological critique of the accepted economic and civic conventions of modern man, a critique of his buying and selling, his borrowing and lending, his work in field and factory, in office and shop, his complex of social loyalties and the laws and customs which govern them. The aim of such a critique would be to distinguish clearly between actions which are capable of being offered to God, actions which express the nature and accord with the destiny of man, and actions which because they cannot be done to the glory of God ought not in fact to be done at all. I believe that the results of such a critique, honestly undertaken, could not fail to be of a disturbing and indeed revolutionary character.

It is obvious that the elaboration and working out of a dichotomy of such fundamental importance for the direction of the spiritual life is a task for the Christian sociologist, whose social standpoint and categories of economic and political criticism are dominated by the Christian doctrine of man and by a passionate and prophetic insistence that our chief earthly task is the humanization of history. It is equally clear that Christian sociology is as essential to the complete equipment of the pastor as it is to that of the evangelist. But since it is agreed on all hands that the pastoral and evangelical ministries are essential departments of the total Christian ministry to the world, we have in effect demonstrated that both the Church and the world require an authentic Christian sociology. It is significant that the Archbishop of Canterbury has recently pointed out to us that critical and constructive social thought is a mark of the Church in these peak moments of her history in which she is most responsive to her divine election and vocation.

Literature.

THE GOSPEL AND INDIA'S HERITAGE.

India is in the headlines: her political future (and how much more ?) depending now, it seems, on a contest of will and armament, involving mainly Britain, Japan, and the Congress party. No really important political problem, however, is *merely* political; more ultimate moral and religious issues are always involved. In this case, indeed, one difficulty seems to be to get Mr. Gandhi to think and act in political terms at all. In his suggested methods of dealing with the Japanese, his appeal to the principle of 'soul-force' (*satyagrata*), he seems to be attempting to deal with a political problem as a *purely* religious problem. To the West he presents the absurd spectacle of a super-fakir, who, instead of sitting for his own personal reasons on a board of nails, is inviting the Indian nation to sit with him on the bayonets of the Japanese army. Is this the 'spirituality' of India, a 'magnificent evasion' (to quote Kraemer) of the real problems, an empty and perverse demonstration of the superiority of spirit and the unreality of matter and all mundane life ? Or, is there something more than that in it, something to be sympathetically understood and even cherished, as offering valuable illumination on the gospel itself to the cruder naturalistic mind of the West ?

Dr. Appasamy in *The Gospel and India's Heritage* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), supported by the National Christian Council of India in his effort, tries to relate the 'best traditions of Indian religious life' positively to the Christian faith. The spirituality of Hinduism (Islam is not discussed in the book) is taken to be a great heritage of the Indian people, to be brought (as it were) to the feet of Christ as a gift. The book is written with a view to translation into the chief languages of India, and is not primarily intended for the Church of the West, nor even for missionaries of western origin. It is not perhaps surprising in this context that no attention is paid to the Barthian contrast between the 'revelation of God' and 'human religiousness.' The doctrines and practice of Christianity and Hinduism are compared in a straightforward, clear, and methodical way. The author is eager to show how the Hindu mind is prepared and conditioned to appreciate the gospel, especially as it is presented in St. John. His success in 'indianizing' the presentation of the gospel can be judged adequately only by an Indian. What the Western Christian inevitably looks for is adequacy in the presentation of the Christian faith which is and must remain common to the Church, east or west, and some evidence of the capacity of Indian experience to illumine and vivify the perhaps too familiar gospel message. It must be said that Dr. Appasamy seeks always to give due emphasis to what distinguishes Christianity from Hinduism. For example, in depicting Christ as *sannyasi* par excellence, he reminds his readers that although a homeless man, and deliberately so for the sake of His mission, Jesus did

not renounce all joy in life, but attended feasts and marriages and got Himself from some the name of a 'gluttonous man and a wine-bibber.' Yet the emphasis leans to the *sannyasi* ideal, and there is no real reconciliation, in a richer conception, of the ascetic individualism of the *sannyasi* and the natural and social elements in Christian saintliness. In the same way it is hinted that Hindu techniques, such as *yoga*, may contribute something to Christian spiritual development (the Indian *form* being adapted to a Christian *content*) but no real attempt is made to reconcile the very different principles involved in the ethical conception of Communion with God, and the Hindu metaphysical conception of identity with God, upon which *yoga* is based. Again, is it mere Western or British prejudice to doubt whether Mr. Gandhi's ethics of non-violence represents the Christian attitude to the problems with which it attempts to deal? Dr. Appasamy has not convinced one reader that these indubitably Indian ideals and practices assist us directly and positively to a clearer understanding or a more lively appreciation of the Christian faith. The impression is rather deepened that Christianity defines itself over against the 'best' Hindu religious traditions by contrast. Confusion is easier than fusion where the relation of the two religions is concerned. The question of 'naturalizing' Christianity in India is not closed by this conclusion, nor is it suggested that Dr. Appasamy achieves only confusion. He avoids this, but only by leaving the two systems side by side, unassimilated even where they seem most similar.

The book in English is welcome; its greatest usefulness will doubtless be in translation into the chief Indian languages and in the Indian church, for which purpose it was written.

JOHN M. GRAHAM.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

This review of *The Sermon on the Mount* by Mr. C. F. Andrews, with a foreword by Rabindranath Tagore (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), might well have been headed 'C. F. Andrews,' for the book is fully as much a revelation of its author as it is an exposition of the great Dominical discourse. There can have been few men who have more literally *lived* the Sermon on the Mount. It was his religion and his life, and one is hardly surprised at the extraordinary, almost extravagant, terms in which Rabindranath Tagore pays his tribute to his beloved friend whose love he describes as the greatest blessing of his life.

The author acknowledges a deep debt to Bishop Gore whose book on the Sermon on the Mount came to him at a critical and impressionable period of his life. But there is little of Gore in this book, or of anybody else than its writer. There is a freshness in it like that of Nature when she is putting forth her first green beauty, and an originality that belongs to all books that come straight off their authors' minds and out of their hearts.

Apart from what has been said, there are one or two points of special interest worth mentioning. The writer repeatedly insists on the fact that our Lord used 'picture language' such as all simple, country people love to hear in homely talk, for it can be taken away and remembered without any danger of becoming vague and indefinite. Moreover, it cannot be taken too literally. 'Christ's whole outlook on life was the opposite of formal literalness. He is the Poet, not the Doctor of the Law. To bind the disciple down to the letter of Christ's law would be an outrage on His whole method of teaching.' Another feature of this exposition is that at point after point the author parallels some passage with an incident in our Lord's own life which is manifestly the very best exposition of the meaning of the injunction. And in connexion with the question whether our Lord's commands can be applicable to a society as well as to individuals, Mr. Andrews suggests, what has been appearing lately in several of Mr. Middleton Murry's books, the formation of 'cells' of people pledged to obey as communities the precepts of Christ.

It should be added that in the concluding sections of his book the author quite definitely lays it down that there are certain things or systems which are inconsistent with the mind of Christ as revealed in this sermon. One is the modern industrial system which sets a premium on ruthless and unlimited competition. A second is racial imperialism which has used every violent and untruthful means to bring other races into subjection. And a third is militarism. With these the Christian way of life can have no kind of connexion. The tone of the book is, however, by no means controversial. It is all sweet reasonableness. And both for its suggestive account of our Lord's way of life and for its impressive disclosure of a personality uniquely Christian this book is a very precious possession.

F. J. RAE.

RELIGION AND THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE.

We call to the notice of our readers a little book by Mr. J. B. Coates entitled *A Common Faith or Synthesis* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It is not that the book is likely to commend itself to them in its entirety. Many will object to its socialistic politics. Many will be offended by its repudiation of traditional Christianity. And many, as Professor John Macmurray admits in a commendatory preface, will deprecate any discussion of the social and political issues of the war while the fortune of war is still in the balance. But it is an able and sincere book, and the Christian thinker cannot but read it with sympathetic interest. For the burden of its pages is that the remedy for our present ills is the setting up of a religio-political movement whose function should be to inspire our people with a spirit of brotherhood and service.

Although Mr. Coates repudiates traditional Christianity with its belief in God and the Incarnation, he believes in the reality and potential effectiveness of the 'religious impulse.' Indeed, as he appears to say, without the operation of the

religious impulse there is little or no hope of a new society or civil order of Europe founded upon the principles of freedom and democracy. But, as he adds, the religious impulse must be associated with belief in 'the Christian ethic of love.' Unfortunately, the ethic of love is not the only ethic that marches under the banner of religion.

We are glad that Mr. Coates thus acknowledges the power of true religion. That may well be the cement needed to bind together the new structure which he envisages. It may, however, be asked, How is the religious impulse to be maintained and fostered? How is it to become widespread, even universal? How, again, is its conjunction with the ethic of love to be perpetuated? Perhaps Mr. Coates will yet come to see more relevance here in the Christian belief in God.

Perhaps also members of the Christian Church will be stirred by the challenge virtually thrown out to them in this book; so that the Churches will not play the subsidiary and evanescent rôle here assigned to them, but take a direct part in the formation of the new synthesis which, as we must agree with Mr. Coates, the fragmentation of our modern culture demands. W. FULTON.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL.

The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion (Epworth Press; 8s. 6d. net) is the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1942. The author, the Rev. Archibald W. Harrison, D.D., a Methodist minister of long experience, says that his book is a result of forty years of 'spasmodic reading' in the literature and history of his subject. The literature is truly voluminous, and an appendix to this work provides a useful guide to it. Had Dr. Harrison also seen fit to furnish his book with an index, some of his readers would have been additionally grateful, especially as the plan of the work is not readily apparent.

The work succeeds in giving us a firm impression of the effects of the great eighteenth-century Revival upon the English-speaking peoples on both sides of the Atlantic. Indeed in doing so it helps us to understand the British Empire and the United States of America to-day. But the emphasis of the work is largely biographical; and we may confidently consult it for reliable and well-balanced accounts on the personal side of such leaders of the Revival as the Wesleys, Whitefield, Howell Harris, Henry Venn, not to speak of many others.

It is true that the unity of doctrine still remaining in the branches of the Christian Church affected by the Revival, and here duly portrayed, has been a powerful factor in recent movements of reunion in Christendom; but the occurrence of the phrase, 'Christian Reunion,' in the title of this book is apt to convey a wrong impression. It is only in a short concluding chapter that Mr. Harrison describes recent steps towards reunion, of which he himself is an enlightened advocate. In particular, he would commend to the Churches concerned the consideration of the significant document recently published by the S.C.M. Press, 'Outline of a Reunion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England.' W. FULTON.

The Twofold Power of the Gospel, by the Rev. Clyde V. Hickerson, B.A., Th.M. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press., Nashville; $1.50), contains ten sermons whose main theme is the sufficiency of the gospel both for the redemption of the individual soul and for the regeneration of the social order, according to the will of God. They are plain and unadorned discourses, but they are full of sound Christian teaching, firm in texture and vigorous in expression.

A New Interpretation of the Cross, by the Rev. Pirie Philip, M.A., B.D. (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net), is a remarkable book as coming from a man who has been well over sixty years in the ministry. It shows uncommon vitality and freshness of mind. The writer, however, appears to have been a somewhat isolated thinker. He writes as if the penal theory of the Atonement, and that in its harshest form, has held the field in Christian thought unchallenged until now. This of course is far from being the case, and the 'new interpretation' which is here offered, emphasizing the unlimited mercy of God, is not nearly so new as it would have been half a century ago. Still it is clearly and vigorously expressed, and though there are points where its theology might be criticised it is full of wholesome evangelical teaching.

In *The Bible and the Ministry* (Dacre Press; 2s. net) the Rev. M. R. Newbolt, Canon of Chester, emphasizes the importance of Bible study as a preparation for the work of the Christian Ministry. He speaks as an Anglican of the High Church persuasion. After showing the large place the Bible occupied in past times in England (he makes an interesting reference to a sermon preached in 1388 by one Richard Wimbledon), he proceeds to give evidence of the widespread ignorance of the Bible at the present day, even among candidates for Holy Orders. He then complains that modern theologians have sought too diligently to read what the latest scholarship has to say about the Bible, rather than set to work to read it for themselves. In concluding with a reference to the relation between Bible and Liturgy he makes much of the point that the primary use of the Bible is its use in public worship, its private use being only secondary. Accordingly, those who desire a systematic scheme of study for their private use should base their daily reading on the daily lessons. We should add that the book is in pamphlet form.

God's Will in Our Time (S.C.M.; 9d. net) is a reprint of the Report presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May 1942 by the Commission for the Interpretation of God's Will in the Present Crisis. This report awakened great interest among the members of the General Assembly, and its presentation in the name of the

Commission by Professor John Baillie made a deep impression. It is proposed to follow up the Report by a study textbook, which should at once elucidate the subject matter and submit it in a form suitable for group discussion. We anticipate a wide circulation for this important document, which marks a new step in the forward policy of the Church of Scotland, showing as it does a newer and more intimate concern in the Civil Order.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

In my previous article I referred to springs and wells, on which the Canaanite and Israelite population largely depended for their water-supply. As these sources, however, often proved to be inadequate, the people had recourse in many cases to Pools and Cisterns.

1. **Pools.**—Several large towns appear to have had no other system of supply than these, whether for domestic or agricultural purposes. The most expeditious and perhaps easiest plan was to raise a dam across an adjacent valley, so as to collect the water from streams or surface drainage. In many cases large rectangular tanks or reservoirs were constructed by excavation, and sometimes had their sides strengthened with revetments of masonry and lined with water-tight cement. The artificial pool thus formed, whether by a dam or excavation, was known in Hebrew by the name *b^{e}rēkâh* (Sept. κολυμβήθρα or κρήνη, Arabic *birkeh*), as distinct from *'ăgam* which was a mere collection of stagnant or muddy water. Thus, we have the *b^{e}rēkâh* of Gibeon (2 S 2^{13}), of Hebron (2 S 4^{12}), of Samaria (1 K 22^{38}), of Heshbon (Ca 7^4), of Shelah or Shiloah (Neh 3^{15} R.V., Is 8^6=Siloam, Jn 9^7), of king Hezekiah (2 K 20^{20}), and various others. The bearers of water filled their leathern bottles at such pools, dogs and asses quenched their thirst at them, and swarms of people and animals sometimes settled down on the banks regardless of the most elementary laws of hygiene.

Later on, in the Hellenistic period, many of these reservoirs were converted into large *piscinæ* ('fish-ponds'), to which additional water was sometimes led from a distance. Most of them, indeed, in the course of time became so transformed through repeated alterations that it is difficult to determine their age. Many, however, must be very ancient. It is possible that the huge *b^{e}rēkâh* of Hebron, to the south of the town, is the identical one on the banks of which David hung the murderers of Ishbosheth (2 S 4^{12}). The *b^{e}rēkâh* of Samaria, in which Ahab's chariot, stained with blood, was washed along with his armour after the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, has been uncovered adjoining the palace by the Harvard excavators, and found to be coated on the sides and bottom with four inches of greyish cement (mixed with wood-ashes) as hard as the rock beneath. Josephus mentions a number of pools at Jerusalem which certainly date from the time of the monarchy, such as the 'Serpents' Pool' (*Wars*, v. 3, 2), which probably corresponds to the Biblical 'Dragons' Spring' (*'En hattannîn*, Neh 2^{13}) in the Hinnom Valley. It was renewed in the twelfth century by the Germans and took the name of 'the German Lake,' but since the time of Suleiman II. (1520–1566 A.D.) it has been known as *Birket es-Sulṭân*. Josephus refers to another great pool in Jerusalem which he calls Amygdalon (Ἀμύγδαλον, *Wars*, v. 11, 4), where the Roman legions encamped while attacking the upper city, and which perhaps stands for *Hammigdalon* ('[Pool of] the Great Tower') from its proximity to Phasælus. It is stated by him to have been located at the north-west of the Second Wall (Nehemiah's), and seems to correspond to the existing *Ḥammâm el-Baṭraq*, which dragomans are fond of calling 'the Pool of Hezekiah' (probably to attract tourists).

The pool system of Jerusalem was greatly improved in Græco-Roman times. It was to Pilate especially that the city was indebted for the aqueduct which brought to the Temple reservoirs the spring waters from the pools of the *Wadi 'Arrûb* and the 'Ortas Valley, though he took the funds required for the purpose from the Temple treasury and thereby caused grave disturbance (*Antiq.* xv. 9, 4, xviii. 3, 2; *Wars*, ii. 9, 4).

2. **Cisterns.**—While the *b^{e}rēkâh* was a common expedient for collecting water, underground cisterns (Hebrew *bôr*, pl. *bôrôth*) were also in use, especially for household purposes, and often turned out to be a valuable possession in time of siege. Such *bôrôth* (which existed in Canaan even before the Hebrew Conquest, cf. Dt 6^{11} R.V., Neh 9^{25} R.V.) were generally hewn out of the solid rock and plastered with limestone cement (which had to be occasionally renewed). In some cases where the rock was soft or porous, or the plaster was not water-tight, they leaked considerably (cf. Jer 2^{13}, 'My people . . . have hewn them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water'). They were mostly fed by rain-water, which was conveyed to them by surface gutters

or pipes from the paved courtyards and flat roofs of the houses. One huge oval cistern found by Macalister at Gezer, to the north of the Maccabean Palace, is believed to be a very old one. It is cut in the rock and is really double, consisting of one cistern below another, each twenty-nine feet and a half in depth, and together holding about six hundred thousand gallons.

It was the ambition of every Hebrew family to have a cistern of their own (as it was to eat of their own vine and fig tree, 2 K 18^{31}, cf. Pr 5^{15}). In the Inscription of Mesha king of Moab (*c.* 842 B.C.), now preserved in the Louvre, every householder was advised to have his own cistern ('There was no cistern in the midst of the city . . . and I said to the people, Make you each a cistern in his house,' lines 24 f.). As this was often prevented, however, by the excessive hardness of the rock or the permeability of the soil, a group of families had often to share the same one. Nevertheless, in many towns these subterranean reservoirs were numerous, as at Gezer where the rock has been found to be honeycombed with them.

As a rule, cisterns took a bottle-shaped form, with a long neck or shaft, and were frequently over twenty feet deep, with a circular opening about three feet in diameter. As they were not provided with an outlet for cleansing purposes, mud and other impurities gathered at the bottom, and the water often became polluted, full of animal life, and dangerous to health, leading to fevers and other sicknesses. Frequently not only waste rubbish as well as bones of dogs and other animals, but human skeletons have been found at the bottom of some of them—a circumstance which suggests tragedy of some kind, perhaps murder or suicide,[1] or else may be due to the fact that from earliest times many cisterns when empty formed convenient prisons or dungeons, from which escape was impossible (cf. Gn 40^{15} 41^{14}, Ex 12^{29}, Is 24^{22}, Jer 37^{16}, La 3^{53}, Zec 9^{11}, etc., where the Hebrew has *bôr* in each case). It was into such a cistern in the courtyard of the guard that Jeremiah was lowered with cords (Jer $38^{6ff.}$), while the accumulated mire at the bottom was still soft; and it was into a roadside one that Joseph was cast by his brethren (Gn $37^{20ff.}$, where A.V. and R.V. have 'pit,' but the Hebrew has *bôr*).

Occasionally, extensive buildings or installations were provided with more than one cistern. Thus, in the large edifice at *Tell Ta 'anak*, where important letter-tablets were discovered in 1903 belonging to the Amarna period (*c.* 1400 B.C.), two subterranean reservoirs dating from the late Bronze Age were found close together, at right angles to each other, at the bottom of a staircase. Water was led into them from the courtyard pavements and terraces above by means of a conduit which followed the side of the stair. Dr. Sellin and his co-excavators mistakenly took these underground cisterns to be the innermost shrine (Gr. ἄδυτον, Lat. *adytum*) of an ancient sanctuary, and the conduit as the channel down which the blood of the victims flowed.

Cisterns were of particular value in the development of agriculture. The author of Chronicles records (2 Ch 26^{10} R.V.) that a large number were hewn out for this purpose by King Uzziah of Judah ('for he loved husbandry'), both in the hilly country and the lowlands. The innumerable cisterns found in the *Beit Jibrîn* region (where there are also many agricultural silos) were evidently used for a similar purpose. There are large groups of them here of an elaborate nature, forming vast labyrinths, inter-connected, and reached by winding staircases along the rocky sides.

Archæology and the Biblical Text.

Discoveries have enabled scholars to give a clearer interpretation to certain Old Testament words or passages whose meaning has hitherto been obscure or even unknown. We give here a few instances of such clarification or emendation, out of a large and ever-increasing number:

1. Incense Altars.—In Lv 26^{30} and several other passages (2 Ch 14^{3} $34^{4.\ 7}$, Is 17^{8} 27^{9}, Ezk $6^{4.\ 6}$, etc.), the earlier Israelites were enjoined to shun certain objects called *ḥammānîm* (sing. *ḥammān*) used in corrupt Canaanite worship. The meaning of this term has been doubtful, and our translators, doing their best, have rendered it 'images' or 'sun images' (*i.e.* sun-pillars). But an incense altar has been unearthed at Palmyra with this word inscribed on it, and as similar limestone stands with four horns have been found in Israelite towns, dating from as early as the tenth century B.C., it is evident that *ḥammānîm* were altars used for incense (cf. Hos 4^{13}), as Harald Ingholt, K. Elliger, and Professor Albright have shown),[2] probably associated with the god *Baal-ḥammôn*. In earlier times still, the term may have also been applied to terra-cotta braziers and similar stands for heating (from *ḥmm* 'to be hot').

2. Birds Fluttering.—In Gn 1^{2}, a Hebrew verb *rāḥap* is used, being translated 'moved' (R.V. 'was brooding'). The same word occurs only in Dt 32^{11}, where it is translated 'fluttereth' (both A.V. and R.V.), and in Jer 23^{9} where it is rendered 'is broken' (both A.V. and R.V.). This perplexity of our translators over the word has now

[1] Cf. Duncan, *Digging up Biblical History*, ii. 27.

[2] Cf. Ingholt, *Mélanges Dussaud*, ii. (1940); Elliger, ZAW (1939), 256 ff.; Albright, *From Stone Age to Christianity*, 237.

been removed by the discovery of it in a Ras Shamra text (the *Dn'il* poem), where it is used several times of a bird 'fluttering' or 'hovering' over a place. The translation, therefore, in Deuteronomy seems to be the correct one, and Jer 23[9] should probably read 'My heart fluttereth (*i.e.* trembles or palpitates) within me.'

3. Thy Servant a Dog.—In 2 S 7[21] David in one of his prayers says 'For thy word's sake, and according to thy heart,' while in the corresponding passage in 1 Ch 17[19] we read 'For thy servant's sake, and according to thy heart.' The Hebrew words 'and according to thy heart' (*w-kᵉlibkā*), if taken without the vowels (which do not occur in Hebrew and were only inserted by the Massoretes about the seventh century A.D.), may equally mean 'and thy dog'; and, as the expression 'thy servant' and 'thy dog' are often associated in the Amarna and the Lachish Letters (when a vassal addresses his lord) as well as in the Old Testament (cf. 2 S 9[8], 2 K 8[13], etc.), the correct text must have been 'For the sake of thy servant and thy dog.' The change, moreover, in Hebrew in the first clause from 'thy servant' (*'bdk*) to 'thy word' (*dbrk*) is so slight as easily to constitute a scribal mistake.

4. The Land of Ḳuë.—We read in 1 K 10[28] R.V. (=2 Ch 1[16]) 'The horses which Solomon had were brought out of Egypt; and the king's merchants received them in droves, each drove at a price.' The word 'Egypt' here (Heb. *Miṣraim*) is no doubt meant for *Muṣri*, a country just north-east of the Cilician Gates, for it is unlikely that the Egyptians, who had no suitable pastures for horses, could have had an export trade in these. Further, the Hebrew word for 'in droves,' 'each drove' (*miḳwēh*), if the vowels (which were not in the original) be altered, may be translated 'from *Ḳuë*' (*miḳōwĕh*). The sentence, therefore, should probably read 'The horses . . . were brought from *Muṣri* and from *Ḳuë*, and the king's merchants received them from *Ḳuë* at a price.' The Septuagint, instead of *Ḳuë*, translates '*Thekoue*' (θεκουε), and the Vulgate gives 'Coa,' but the land of *Ḳuë*, which was in the Cilician region adjoining *Muṣri*, was a well-known one, famed for its horse-breeding (cf. Ezk 27[14]), and is mentioned in Assyrian documents and in the Inscription of Zakar (king of Hamath, *c.* 820 B.C.).[1]

5. Azariah's Leprosy.—We read that, when king Azariah was smitten with leprosy (2 K 15[5]), he was forced to live in a house of 'freedom' (Hebrew *ḥopšīt*). Translators have been puzzled by this expression, and the A.V. calls it a 'several' house, the R.V.m. a 'lazar' house, while the American Standard Version in a marginal note suggests 'infirmary.' Twice, however, in the Ras Shamra poems we are informed that Aleyan Baal descended into the house of *ḫptt* (or *ḫpšt*, for in Hebrew the Ras Shamra *ṯ* (i.e. *th*) and *š* coalesced), and from there to the underworld.[2] It follows, therefore, that Azariah's leprosy, in separating him from others, must have driven him to the basement of his palace or perhaps to some cellar there.

6. Solomon's Copper Platform.—In 2 Ch 6[13] we read that Solomon stood before the Temple altar on a copper *kîyôr* (translated 'scaffold'), five cubits square and three high, while he prayed to Yahweh. This word in other passages means a portable laver, probably set on a wheeled carriage of copper. But, as Professor Albright has pointed out,[3] from Syrian and other monumental representations we now know that Solomon's stand was a copper platform of some box kind with a lid. On a limestone stela (dating about 1400 B.C.) found at Ras Shamra, a king is shown standing on a box or chest apparently of metal, while he prays with uplifted hands to Baal. On another stela from Lower Egypt, now in the Cairo Museum, a votary (probably a priest) is portrayed standing with upraised hand on a box or chest on legs. He has beside him an altar of incense and stands in front of a Syrian deity who has a sceptre in his hand. Solomon's platform is thus explained from the religion of neighbouring countries, but whether the copper box contained sacred objects, or was perhaps meant for resonance or superior position is unknown.

7. Binding the Springs.—We read in Job 28[11] R.V. 'He bindeth the streams that they trickle not' (literally 'from trickling,' margin 'from weeping'). In the Hebrew the words 'the streams from trickling' are *mbk nhrt* (leaving out the vowels), and this identical expression occurs in a Ras Shamra text as *mbk nhrm*, where it clearly signifies 'the sources of the streams.' In the Biblical text we should therefore translate 'He bindeth the sources of the streams.'

8. Riding on the Clouds.—In Ps 68[4] R.V., God is described as 'He that rideth through the deserts.' The Hebrew word here for 'deserts' (or 'desert-plains') is *'arābôth* (cf. 2 K 25[5], where it is translated 'plains'; Jer 5[6] R.V.m. 'deserts'), but one would naturally expect *'ābôth* 'clouds,' for 'He that rideth on the clouds' is a familiar Biblical expression (Ps 104[3], Is 19[1], cf. also Ps 68[33], Nah 1[3], etc.). Consequently some scholars have held that the latter was the original reading. The former word, however, has now been found to occur several times in the Ras Shamra texts under the form *'rpt*, meaning 'clouds' (cf. Akkad.

[1] Cf. CAH, iii., *sub* Muṣri and Ḳuë.

[2] I*AB, v. 15; II AB, viii. 7; cf. Albright, *Jour. Pal. Or. Soc.*, xiv. 131 n.

[3] *Archæol. and the Religion of Israel*, 152.

erpitu, urpatu, 'cloud'), and Aleyan Baal is several times described as 'He that rideth on the clouds' (*'rpt*).[1] The Hebrew Biblical reading is thus vindicated, though its correct rendering is not 'deserts' but 'clouds.'

9. Going down to the Pit.—Ps 88[4] says 'I am counted with those who go down into the pit.' In a Ras Shamra text Baal's messengers are warned not to go near two mountains 'at the bourne (?) of the underworld,' but to descend into the subterranean regions by stealth, and in this way they would be 'counted among those who go down to the underworld,' *i.e.* they would be treated as though they were ordinary shades descending to Hades. The same verb *yārad* 'to go down' is used in both texts. It thus seems that by the 'pit' in the Biblical text is not meant the 'grave,' but the home of departed spirits, good and bad, the opposite of the upper regions of life and light.[2]

10. Great King.—We have mention in Hos 5[13] 10[6] of a strange 'king Jareb' (*melek yārēb*), quite unknown to history. Long ago it was proposed by some scholars to alter this to *malki rab* 'great king,' a change which can be made by a mere alteration of the vowels, and this textual emendation is now confirmed by the frequent occurrence of the expression 'great king' (*sharru rabu*) in Assyrian and other documents (cf. also 2 K 18[19. 28], Is 36[4]). In fact, in one of the letters of the Hittite king Shuppiluliuma to the Ugaritian king Niqmed the very words of the conjectured reading in Hosea have been found, and correspond exactly to the Assyrian expression.

11. The 'Herdsman' Amos.—In Am 1[1] the rare Hebrew word *nôḳēd* is rendered 'herdsman' (the prophet being described as a 'herdsman' of Tekoa). But *nôḳēd* occurs in a colophon of the Ras Shamra texts (I*A), where its meaning seems to be 'sheepmaster' or 'sheep-raiser,' being applied there to a certain high official who was also *rb khnm* ('high priest'). This accords with 2 K 3[4], where the word is used of Mesha king of Moab, and is actually translated 'sheepmaster.' It thus seems to have an official meaning above that of 'shepherd,' and Amos may have occupied a higher position than usually suspected.

Children's Games.

Unfortunately, the notices in the Bible regarding children's games are very few, and we are left largely to our conjectures. But children, both in palace and humble home, are the same in all ages. Those of three thousand years ago did not differ from those of to-day in their diversions. The Israelites were no exception to the rule. The prophet Zechariah (8[5]) stated, as a token of the peace and prosperity of the future Jerusalem, that the streets would be full of boys and girls playing in them. Whatever games the Israelite children had, there was no doubt a certain amount of mimicry in a few of them, some quaint imitation or comic burlesque of what they had seen their elders do. We know from the Talmud that this imitation was one of the amusements of Jewish children, and Jesus has made us familiar with children playing in the market-place at mock weddings and mock funerals (Mt 11[17], Lk 7[32]). A Jewish wedding was then, as Eastern ones still are, a very gay spectacle suiting the fancy of children, and a Jewish funeral must have been of a striking and dramatic nature.

The children of ancient Egypt, as far back as the twelfth dynasty (*c.* 2000 B.C.), are known to have had a variety of toys, many hundreds of which have been found in houses and tombs. They had dolls of ingenious construction, made of all kinds of material (wood, terra-cotta, limestone, ivory, etc.), some of these being jointed, moved by strings (like the modern jumping-jacks), carefully painted, and adorned with amulets or artificial wigs or prophylactic objects. They had also many animal and other figures for their amusement, such as wooden birds, jointed frogs, and the Egyptian toy *par excellence*—the crocodile (with movable jaws). Many toys were made purposely grotesque so as to amuse, such as a monkey driving a chariot, a dwarf with a cat's head, or a negro chasing a panther.

If the children of Egypt had their games and toys, those in Palestine could not have lacked them. Many models of various kinds, including human and animal figures, have been discovered in Palestine, and although the vast majority of these must have been connected with religious, magical, or social activities, the possibility that some of them may have served simply as toys cannot be ruled out altogether. Israelite children must have had their dolls, as well as whips, rattles, balls (made of leather and filled with straw), and other playthings, while diversions like racing jumping, and dancing (cf. Job 21[11]) were probably much in favour. They seem to have amused themselves too with tame birds. 'Wilt thou play with him as with a bird?' is God's remonstrance to Job in reference to the crocodile (Job 41[5]). In the Talmud we read of children's games played with nuts, and when we remember the Latin proverb *nucibus relictis* ('having ceased to be children,' literally 'having put away the nuts'), perhaps we may find a reference to such games in Paul's words, 'When I was a child, I thought as a child, but when I became a man I put away childish things' (1 Co 13[11]).

[1] I*AB, ii. 7; II AB, iii. 18; v. 122.
[2] Cf. Albright, *Archæol. and the Religion of Israel*, 89.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Resistez.'

By the Reverend R. C. Broughton, B.D., Cosby, Leicester.

'Whom resist stedfast in the faith.'—1 P 5^9.

The Free French Protestants who are now in this country have issued a beautiful badge, which tells an interesting story. The badge itself is in the shape of a shield and its colours are blue, white, and red. Right across the top it has in letters of gold the one word '*Resistez*,' which of course is our 'Resist.'

Just below that motto is a picture of a dark tower. It represents the tower of Constance at Aigues-Mortes, in Provence. Over two hundred and fifty years ago a girl of fifteen was imprisoned in this gloomy place and she did not leave it until she was fifty-three. Her name was Marie Durand, and her only crime was that she wanted to worship God with the freedom of the Protestant faith. Very few people could have stood the strain of being shut away for all the best years of their lives. But Marie Durand had a secret. She got a nail, and on the wall of the tower she scratched one word, '*Resistez*.' Day by day she, and those with her, looked at it and said to themselves, 'We can't give in now. We shall hold out to the end. We will resist.' And we know how splendidly they did it. No wonder the descendants of such brave people have written '*Resistez*' in letters of gold!

In the remaining space below the tower there are two crosses on the badge. One is the cross which is still worn by the descendants of such as Marie Durand. It is known as the Huguenot Cross and it speaks of the courage of such heroic folk. The other cross tells of another brave French woman—Joan of Arc. Her cross is the cross of Lorraine and is now the emblem of the Free French Forces. It also tells of a heroine who resisted nobly for her country's sake. She was not a Protestant like Marie Durand, but a Catholic. It is very fitting now that after all these years both names stand together as perfect examples of those who resisted what they saw to be wrong.

Would it not be a fine thing if we adopted the same motto and set it in letters of gold across our lives? '*Resistez*'—'We will resist evil in every way we can.' The New Testament is always urging us to do so. 'Watch and pray,' said Jesus, 'that ye enter not into temptation.' St. Paul said that Satan went about camouflaged as an angel of light. We shall have to be pretty wide awake to spot his activities! And St. Peter compared the Evil One to a 'roaring lion, walking about, seeking whom he may devour,' and he added the wise warning, 'whom *resist* stedfast in the faith.'

Now what power will be able to make us strong enough to resist and conquer? Here the Free French Protestants are very wise, because they answer twice, 'By the Cross of Jesus.' They have found that if we give ourselves to Jesus who died for us on the Cross, He gives us in return power to resist.

So go forward bravely. The forces of evil will always be attacking us. We must always be on guard. We must *Resist*. But with the strength which Jesus gives we shall triumph as Marie Durand did two hundred years ago.

A Harvest Talk.

By the Reverend Ronald W. Thomson, Burton-on-Trent.

'Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.'—Mt 6^{32}.

We do take a lot of things for granted, don't we? We come rushing in from school, and are quite sure that there will always be a meal ready for us. We assume that there will be clean socks and shirts for us when we need them, and neatly darned socks, too, in spite of the great holes we made in them. We take it all for granted. Now I believe that our Harvest Services ought to remind us that behind so many of the other things we take for granted—fruit and flowers in our garden, a harvest in the fields—is the love and care of God, our heavenly Father. And so to-day we are bidden to look up and thank Him.

I have been reading lately a book by an American doctor, *A Doctor's Odyssey* he calls it. In this book Dr. Heiser has some interesting chapters on leprosy which helped me to understand the beautifulness of Jesus touching the lepers and healing them. Dr. Heiser says that it is common for those who have leprosy to feel no pain. Long, long ago, he says, William of Tyre told how it was discovered that Baldwin, son of Amory, King of Jerusalem, was a leper. One day the future king was playing with other boys, and they were badly scratched. The others cried, but Baldwin did not. At first his tutor thought he was being very brave, but presently found that he had felt no pain at all. His arm had no feeling in it—it was asleep with leprosy. That sounds horrible—but is it not nearly as horrible to God when we receive all His good gifts, 'nightly sleep and daily food,' and show no signs of gratitude? How disappointed you feel if you save up your money, and buy someone a present, and they take no interest in it! Don't you think God is hurt too, when we forget to say, 'Thank you'?

But the Harvest says something else to us, it reminds us that God is very faithful. Once again He has fulfilled His promise, seedtime and harvest have not failed. God never will fail us.

Do you remember the White Knight in Lewis

Carroll's book? He tried to be armed against every possible emergency that might befall him, even carrying a beehive and a mousetrap? So some people try to take precautions, so that nothing will happen to them that they cannot handle. The wisest people, however, know that no one can foresee the future—but they do know that every foot of the way God will be near, and that He will never fail them.

When you have been in the country I expect you have seen in some of the fields a queer figure, dressed in an old coat many sizes too big, with a dirty hat pulled down over his eyes, and arms stuck out. What is that figure? A scarecrow! But it does not always scare the crows away. Why is it there? Because generation after generation, for many, many years there have been these figures in our fields. Once upon a time, a long way back in the past, these were gods, the gods of the field. And the farmer and his family stood before them and offered gifts and prayers for a good harvest. Long after people forgot why the god of the field was there men still set him up, and gradually called him a scarecrow.

You and I know that we need not set up a god in the field, we need not wear a mascot, to make sure that all will be well in the future. We have a Father we can depend on, a God who will take care of us, whose love is always round about us.

The Christian Year.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The New Order of Jesus Christ.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.'—Mt 20^{27}.

Jesus Christ announced a New Order, and to this order Christian folk are pledged. He introduced it by His own example. 'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life.' And He said, 'the disciple shall be as his master.'

It was a New Order, for it turned the world's values upside down. The old idea had been that greatness lay in power and authority. Jesus proclaimed the supremacy of service. He is the King of love. Christ's New Order is the revolution for which the world still waits.

Many books and speeches to-day complain about the failure of the Church; not saying as some do in an entirely scornful and unbelieving way that religion is just nonsense, but saying reproachfully and wistfully that the Church might have done better; it had the light, the knowledge that was the only hope for mankind, but it lacked courage and faith and sincerity and readiness for sacrifice, and so it has let the world down.

All the same the imperfect Church has never failed entirely to deliver its message. It has made known far and wide the cross of Jesus Christ. It has brought to nations the knowledge of the Word of God. Men have turned away, not just from the Church but also from the gospel that, however faultily, the Church proclaimed. And once and again earnest men who have criticized the Church's gospel, and tried to work out for themselves the teaching that would set the world on right lines have come to lay all their emphasis on the very message that Christ Himself brought, and that, however imperfectly, His Church has preached, if not always practised.

Two recent books are instances. One is Sir Richard Acland's *The Forward March*. This title refers to Mr. Churchill's words, 'Long live the forward march of the common people of all lands towards their true and just inheritance,' and also to General Smuts' famous saying, 'Events are again fluid. The great caravan of humanity is once more on the march.' Sir Richard's summing up of the situation is that liberty and equality and prosperity have been sought for a long recent period by the method of leaving each man free to promote his own interest. The failure of this method is now apparent, and a new plan or theory or faith must take its place. He does not know exactly how to name this new order; his suggestion is to call it the 'Service-community.' It is not to be, as in the narrow, evil vision of the Nazis, the mastery of one race over all the others, but a service-community for all humanity, in which the dominant motive in every man's work will be, not the idea of getting on, or getting things for himself, but the idea of serving his fellows. What is this but the New Order of Christ?

The other book is John Strachey's *A Faith to Fight for*. There the author breaks away from his former narrower view that the motive power in human affairs was economics, the concern for bread and butter, and proclaims his faith in truth and love. Truth for him means reality, as it means in the Gospel according to John, and as it means where Kipling writes of the artist who

> 'Shall draw the Thing as he sees It for the God of Things as They Are.'

Truth means for one thing science, which finds and describes the realities of the natural world and so destroys superstition and magic. For another thing truth means facing with open-eyed sincerity the actualities of social life without evasion of the way things work out in practice.

The law is the same for rich and poor, but can the poor pay the fees? Do a few bursaries make educational opportunities equal for all.

And, more especially, in writing of love, Strachey makes the contrast between the order based on fear and power and ruthlessness, and that resting on persuasion and love and service. In one fine passage he recalls how in the Middle Ages a thousand brushes painted the picture of ten thousand girls holding a child in their arms, calling the girl Mary, the Mother of God and the Child Jesus, the Son of God. 'What the pictures really said,' Strachey says, 'was that fear and force and hate are insignificant, aimless, hopeless

things. Love alone gives purpose to life. Art was an enormous propaganda for re-civilizing a barbarous world.' So this economist finds his way to the Christian message, and, with his own views of the needs of the modern world, proclaims the ideal of love and service taught by Jesus Christ.

The world needs a New Order, for the old is gone. It went because men had lost any faith in it. Every one ought to be not only working or fighting, but thinking, reading, and praying about the changes that must come in the world and in men's hearts if victory is to bring healing and hope to mankind. J. B. Priestley has written, 'I think most of us would agree that the "tradition and heritage" appeal was sadly overdone before the war. . . . We do not want to be led by people who are perpetually facing backwards.' A witty little article appeared in a Glasgow newspaper, shortly after an air raid, upon the text, 'Remember Lot's Wife.' Taking the chapter in Genesis about the destruction of the cities of the plain as the story of the first blitz, the writer found in Lot's wife, looking back on her smouldering home, a likeness to many a woman who gazed at the heap of rubble marking the spot where she had lived in happy comfort among her possessions and household goods and wondered if anything might yet be saved from the ruin or if there might be a possibility of repair or restoration and eventual return. How natural, with memory plucking at the heart strings, to look back! Can one blame Lot's wife? Jesus however took the story as it stands in Genesis, where the disaster is a Divine judgment, and Lot's wife is turned into a pillar of salt for her disobedience to the command not to look back; and uses it without sentiment to enforce the point that a time or times will come when there is no room for hesitation or delay and the backward glance is fatal.

Often enough, judgment is not a penalty imposed from without but the revelation and inevitable result of evil already present. The breakdown of peace between civilized states is a revelation of the rottenness of a civilization which had lost its religious basis and had no unifying faith, no common reverence for Jesus Christ and His gospel. Thus there will be little to hope for if the energies of men are directed to the restoration of the former 'status quo.' In the old order people to whom news of all mankind was brought every day, people who, through modern trade and commerce benefited hourly by the services of workers all over the globe, had so narrow an outlook that they thought it possible to lead safe and comfortable lives in their own country, while people in China and Spain and Abyssinia were murdered and plundered. In the old order people imagined that nations might maintain peace and successfully work out political and trading relations while the bearing of religion on matters of public honour and social justice was ignored, and that without zealous effort by the church, Christianity would just gradually spread. And still, even while all sorts of drastic alterations —huge taxation, restrictions, controls—are being accepted bravely and cheerfully, many say, 'It is just for the duration,' and comfort themselves with the idea of getting back to old ways and old grooves when peace comes. That is a notion doomed to disappointment and carrying the seed of frightful danger. Is not hope for the future bound up with the degree to which people will not look back but even at the expense of personal interests and cherished habits move forward to work out some new and better methods of dwelling together on the face of God's habitable earth where the liberality of Providence offers enough for all and where all alike are dear to God's grace?

This New Order must be Christ's Order, based on a belief in the Fatherhood of God, involving the brotherhood of men. The fight to-day is for another chance to realize this New Order which men have hitherto failed to operate.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Crucified unto the World.

'The cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world.'—Gal 6^{14} (R.V.).

These are exceedingly strong words, and they could only be uttered with sincerity by one who, like the Apostle, has reached a superlatively high level of Christian character and discipleship. Yet that only makes them the more worthy of our consideration. In our spiritual journeying, as in other forms of journeying, we have to set our direction by the mountain tops or by the stars.

What does the Apostle mean by the world? Deep and central in the Christian outlook is something which we call the renunciation of the world. But what is this world which must be renounced, this worldliness which must be opposed? Quite certainly it is not a matter of not permitting ourselves to be interested in, to delight in, this world considered as a work of the Creator. Writing to the Romans Paul said, using the word 'world' in this other and more genial sense, 'the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his eternal power and divinity.' There is no thought in these words of being crucified to the world, any more than there was in the mind of the Master when He delighted in the beauty of the flowers of the field.

Nor again is the world, or the spirit of worldliness, to be identified with the genial pleasures of human life and society. That there is a danger in the more immediately and superficially pleasurable things of life is, of course, a commonplace. Pleasures so swiftly become ends in themselves. But it is certainly not the Christian view to lump all delights, even the shallower and more frivolous delights, together, and label them as being 'of the world.' This is only worth saying because such misconceived notions of worldliness still linger on in many of our consciences, or what we think to be such, even though we repudiate them in our minds and by our deeds.

What then is meant by the world? John has given in his first epistle a definition which is

assuredly not far from the mind of Paul. He says it is 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life.' What exactly John meant by these phrases, and what illustrations he would have given from the life of his own time, it is impossible to say. But in a general way the matter is clear. It is a question of the inner motives and desires which actually dominate and set the direction of the life, whatever may be its merely external poses and professions.

The desire of the flesh: what is that but the continuous, subtle pull of the body on a man's conduct, swerving again and again, without his knowing it, the whole direction of the life—all the body's instinct after comfort and self-maintenance, and away from pain and hardness and self-denial? A man has not conquered the body merely because he is not troubled by its grosser appetites, or because now that his income is less he cannot pamper it so much.

And then *the lust of the eyes*: what is that but desire to grasp as much as possible of the good things which this life immediately offers, and which we can see other people striving after all around us? It is the lure of the immediate, the subtle thought, which we hardly ever put into explicit terms, but which is not the less operative for that—that after all we pass this way but once, and unless we grasp all we can of what is now visible and within our reach we shall miss so much. The attitude can be observed in a crude form in children. A bright and glittering object is presented to the eyes and the hand instantly goes out to grasp. Countless adult folk have never really got beyond such an infantile attitude, though they may exercise it in a more refined way.

And then there is *the vainglory of life*—the self-conceit, the desire for praise and deference, the delight of being thought an important and significant person, of wielding power over others, of being in the limelight; all the empty vanities of fashion and custom and title and office and uniform and status, the little snobbish impostures into which men tumble before ever they are aware of it.

Why, then, does the Apostle call all this sort of thing—the lure of the body, the covetousness of the eye, the pride of life—the 'world'? The word 'world' conveys the idea of organized power, something larger than the individual in which the individual is, and by which he is continually influenced and shaped. This is important. We have not seen the real problem of the moral and spiritual emancipation of men, until we realize that the desire of the body, the desire of the eye, and the vainglory of life are a world in this sense. These distorted visions, false ambitions, wrong ideals, impostures and unrealities, have constructed a social organism in harmony with themselves which begins at once to bind and shape every new life which is born into it. That is what makes the problem of our regeneration so difficult. All the time we are being subjected to the influences, so subtle and unnoticed many of them, of a society, a world, built up on these perverted values of comfort and acquisition and vainglorious reputation. Quite plainly, to get a man out of this world or system, to emancipate him from all these false values, is going to be a tremendous operation. It will need to be drastic, violent, decisive. We have only to look into our own hearts to know that.

The greatness of the problem, *the drastic vigour of the emancipating act*, if it is to break through such systematized and ingrained illusions, is reflected in the word Paul uses—crucified! We have not in our modern English a word with something of the grim and crashing absoluteness of this word 'crucified.' We do not easily think in these days in such violent metaphors, but there is truth in them. There is nobody who knows his own heart, and the kind of values which rule the whole structure of our civilized life, who does not also know that we shall never be saved into anything like the mind of Christ by gentle and beautiful exhortations, eloquent appeals to our better nature, church services however glorious, courses of moral exercise however cunningly devised. Something more violent is necessary.

That something—the Apostle's tremendous words suggest—is given in the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

I set the Cross with its physical agony alongside the desire of the body—my love of comfort, my continuous excuses for avoiding anything which may spoil that comfort. I set the Cross with all the naked and outcast poverty of it, the running out of a glorious life in premature death for the sake of a distant vision, beside my desire of the eye, my instant, childish itch to grasp any visible thing, to enlarge and expand my present state, my fear to let the immediate delight go for a remoter and uncertain ideal, my subtle and permeating acquisitiveness. I set the Cross with its loneliness and shame alongside the empty vanities with which my beloved ego decks me out, even if it be only on the little stage my situation allows me. I remind myself that this is He whom I call Lord and for a moment, at least, I see myself as I am. I despise myself.

And this also I see with overwhelming clearness, that it was the desire of the body, the desire of the eye, the vainglory of life, which crucified Him.

Many years ago there was a picture in the Academy entitled, 'Were you there when they crucified the Lord?' Every man should carry, if only in the pocket of his mind, a crucifix, and should train himself when need arises to take it out and look at it. 'So you *were* there when they crucified the Lord.'

Yet that is not all. Our emancipation from the world, our cleansing from its false values, is not complete, touching the deeps of our being, if we are forced merely to a detestation of ourselves. When we have faced the question, when we have been constrained to answer in a bleak moment of sincerity, 'I am there when they crucify the Lord,' what then? Well, if we are hearing God's word to us in the Cross of Christ, it would be well to hear the whole of it. We are not meant

to ignore the prayer that rose out of His mighty spirit for those that crucified Him—'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Was that prayer unanswered? Is it not rather the divine spirit of forgiveness itself, which in its very condemnation, by its very condemnation, is seeking to heal? And dare we not think that there was another prayer, prayed later even for Judas when he cried, 'I have betrayed innocent blood,'—'Father, forgive him, for he now knows what he has done.' [1]

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Harvest Thanksgiving Sermon.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN HOWAT, B.D., BALLATER.

'Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.'—Jn 6^{12}.

There is greater need than ever this year that the safe ingathering of the harvest should be brought prominently before our minds, when we are met to offer worship to Him, in whose providence seedtime and harvest regularly succeed each other. Never before perhaps have the harvests of these islands been so all-important as they are now; with the result that it has become one of the principles of our war strategy to ensure that every available acre in the country is placed under cultivation, and that everything is done to have the harvest reaped and garnered with expedition and care. The spirit of our text is reflected in our national policy—'Gather up the fragments . . . that nothing be lost.'

I wonder if you have noticed how the war is bringing many of the key words and ideas of the Christian gospel into the currency of everyday thought and speech. We find ourselves speaking quite naturally and with none of the strain of self-conscious piety about the need for self-denial, for making sacrifices, for fasting, for watchfulness, for faith, for putting on our armour and fighting the good fight. That certainly does not make war with all its cruelty and destruction any less barbarous, but it does suggest that we have not understood our religion aright, unless we see it as always concerned with a warfare. Christianity was at the beginning born out of a conflict, a conflict that involved pain and suffering and led to the supreme sacrifice on the Cross, a conflict that brought darkness and defeat and death, but out of which there emerged the everlasting victory over the powers of hell and the grave. It need not surprise us, therefore, that many of our experiences at the present time should throw new light upon different aspects of our Christian faith, and that many of the things that press so heavily upon our hearts and call forth our valour and determination should send us back to the New Testament with quickened insight into the things we find there.

Our text here is just one example of this. 'Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.' Not a day passes without our being exhorted to do that. In a war in which the expenditure runs into hundreds of millions, in which the armaments in their power and mass and intricacy leave us baffled and breathless, in which every country of the world is to some extent affected, we find this same emphasis on the importance of little things. The meagre harvest of some small croft, the produce of the most unpromising cabbage-patch, the frugal savings of the poorest, even the refuse of our homes—all have become precious. None of them must be wasted; all must be safely gathered in, that nothing be lost. Nothing is too small, too trivial, that we can afford to neglect it or lose it.

I. Perhaps the most obvious application of this principle is in the field of character. You can judge a man by his attitude to the little things, the things we usually dismiss as unimportant and beneath our notice. You remember our Lord's words, 'He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much.' You remember also what He said to the man of one talent and about such a trivial action as giving a cup of cold water. The little things are very often the truest indication of a man's character—the words he lets drop in an unguarded moment, the quick changes in his facial expression, the way he carries himself. They all have an important tale to tell.

It is quite natural that we should prefer to concentrate on what we consider are the big things in life. It ministers to our self-importance to think that our record will be judged by the part we play in the great causes and popular movements, in which we study to show ourselves in the best light possible; but very often we are more truly self-revealing in the trifling things that we hope and believe pass unobserved. If a man cannot prove his capabilities in small things, he is not likely to be any more successful when he puts his hand to the big things. What does it profit if your architect can plan a magnificent edifice in massive proportions, if the roof leaks, and the chimneys won't draw, and the drains are past speaking about?

II. What a difference, when we turn to the works of Creation and Providence! There surely we see the infinite care of God for the little things. Though the immensity of the starry firmament staggers us, we pause in wonder before the intricate beauty of one snowflake. Though the story of mankind takes us back through thousands of years, think of the capacities for joy and courage and helpfulness in but one human life. Though through the folly and sin of man thousands of our kind are being slaughtered and starved and oppressed, think of the care and skill God has given in perfecting the brain of one of these. With the Creator nothing is lost; the very hairs of our head are numbered.

It is the same with God's purposes in redemption. No one, be he ever so degraded or unimportant, is beyond His seeking love. In the kingdom of the redeemed, into which He would gather every human soul, all that is broken and fragmentary, all that has been wasted and defiled

[1] H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 179.

will not be cast away but purified and made whole. God is eternally solicitous, not just for the mass of men, the abstraction we call humanity, but with each separate soul, knowing as He does each one's needs, each one's failings, each one's faith. How careful was our Lord, when He was on earth, with the broken bits of humanity, the outcast, the lost, and the depraved. Even of the children He said, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not.' Such is God's harvest. What others would lightly and thoughtlessly cast out, He gathers into His garner. Not a sheaf in any field is forgotten; all are precious for His store. The one sheep, the one coin, the one son—how great is His solicitude even for one!

III. Lastly, there is the bearing of this upon our struggle and the part we are playing in it. So often we become depressed by the little we achieve and the apparent worthlessness of our effort. How often we wonder if it is worth while! Think of the blood that only twenty-five years ago was shed to bring to a triumphant conclusion the war that was to end all war; yet here we are again so soon with the same sacrifice and the same task to face. Was that former offering nothing but the folly of human pride, man vainly trying to mould a universe that will not be tamed? Was it all wasted effort? In the harvest of God we may be sure nothing of good is ever lost. He gathers up the fragments into His purpose which is love; and although we cannot discern the pattern of that purpose or understand the mystery of His will, still this we know, that no good deed, no true word, no inspiring thought is ever cast away by Him.

We may not have much to offer Him; the little we have may be tattered and sullied and broken, yet it all counts with Him. A man throwing away his life in a vain attempt to save a drowning friend, who drags them both to destruction; a woman praying for her son who wastes his days in dissipation; a youth who puts behind him the prospects of a career to give his days in the service of some heathen tribe no one has ever heard of—in the eyes and the hand of God there is no waste there. What are little things to us are not so little in His sight. The world's scale of values is often reversed by Him. He gathers up all the fragments, and when the evening of the harvest day is reached it will be found that nothing has been lost.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Faith's Foresight.

B.M.S. Ter-Jubilee Celebrations Sermon.

BY THE REVEREND REGINALD E. WHITE, B.D., TAFFS WELL, CARDIFF.

'For thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Houses and fields and vineyards shall be possessed again in this land.'—Jer 32^{15}.

It may seem a far cry from Jeremiah in his prison purchasing a field to Jesus on the mountain in Galilee commissioning His disciples, and on again to William Carey in Northamptonshire founding the modern missionary enterprise just one hundred and fifty years ago: and yet it seems to me that there is much in common in all three events. A deep and fundamental similarity of attitude links all three in the select company of the heroes of *far-seeing* faith.

Jeremiah bought a field. It was an odd time to speculate in real-estate. Israel was surrounded by a ring of subjected and occupied territories; part of her own domains was already overrun by an implacable enemy; Jerusalem was surrounded by a vast and powerful army; and the only clear-sighted man of God in the city was silenced and in prison. It seems hardly the moment to indulge in extending one's possessions: the purchase must be judged 'an ill-timed venture.' How often one hears that verdict upon the great spiritual enterprises of the servants of God! Maintenance and extension of Christian missions in war-time? . . . 'Surely this is not the time for spiritual ventures!'

And yet Jeremiah's action seems to be perfectly in harmony with all we know of God's great deeds. The ancient idea that Divine activity is ever accompanied by darkness, tempest, floods, earthquakes, and war is not so very far wrong. It is said that the world was passing through a phase of deep unrest, of the extensive migration of peoples, of the clash and conflict of differing cultures, in that far-off day when Abraham walked out of Ur of the Chaldees to begin the quest for a nobler religion than his fathers'. 'Surely not the time for spiritual ventures!' The outlook was bleak enough that day when from the mount in Galilee the Risen Lord sent forth His disciples into Cæsar's empire, beginning at the Jerusalem of the Cross, and the Galilee of the Rejection—'Surely not the time for spiritual ventures!' I have read that it was in a day of civil war, violence, bloodshed, and conquest that the gospel first came to Britain—'Surely not the time for spiritual ventures!' Yet we can thank God someone thought otherwise. So it was in the hour when modern missions were born. The war-drums were throbbing through England, Russia, France, Germany, Turkey, and Poland, and had barely been silenced in America, that day when Carey set sail for India—'Surely not the time for spiritual ventures!' And in these last fifty chaotic years *we* have seen, in the Conferences in Edinburgh, Oxford, Jerusalem, and Madras, the beginnings of a vast new movement of God in our time towards a truly international Church consciousness, and a truly international Christian voice—'Surely not the time for spiritual ventures!' *But it is the time!* God always initiates His new enterprises when the holy places are besieged and the prophets are in prison. Let us have done with pleading the unsuitability of the times as an excuse for indifference to great ventures of faith. After a fearful portrayal of coming wars, famine, pestilence, and calamity our Lord added, 'When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift your heads; for your redemption draweth

nigh.' We, like Jeremiah, Jesus, and Carey must learn to look beyond the darkness and work ahead, with God.

But if Carey's action resembled Jeremiah's in historic circumstance it did also in motive. Jeremiah's purchase of the field was, to Jeremiah, first and foremost an act of obedience to an explicit divine command. 'The word of the Lord came unto me . . .' So was Carey's enterprise. And we do well to remember that any Christian who does not share in some way in the missionary task is disobedient to the final command of the Master in the Great Commission, and thus forfeits the conditional promise of His abiding Presence. For He promised to be with His disciples all the days *in their going into all the world.*

The purchase was, too, in part, an act of preservation by which Jeremiah sought to secure his family name and fortunes in Israel against better times to come. Nowadays all missionary work has something of that aspect. It is not wholly unlike our evacuation of our children and treasures to places of safety. Some day, when the European storm has passed, we here at home may be glad to receive the gospel, and the grace that we have entrusted meanwhile to the safe keeping of peoples overseas.

And the purchase was, again, for Jeremiah, an act of investment. By it, Jeremiah would have his stake, his plot, his own personal share in the restored Israel. When the foe had gone, and the clouds had lifted, and the exiles had returned to their homeland, then there would be a field in Anathoth bearing his family name. He was purchasing his stake in the future glory of his people. Will *you* have a stake in the coming Kingdom of Christ?—any plot, any parcel of ground, any strip of territory in the King's dominions which will bear your name, because you gave, you prayed, you spoke, you went, and so claimed that field for Him? To us it is given by the grace of God to add our contribution to the coming Kingdom of our God, to invest in the divine victory.

And let it be added in passing that the investments of God's people are already paying some unexpected dividends. Two thousand men from the Lushai Hills in Northern India, a district pronounced by the Indian Government within living memory as too perilous for missionary penetration—two thousand Lushai Christians volunteered for stretcher-bearing, and efficiently and cheerfully carried our wounded sons and brothers of the Burmah Expedition through the jungles and across the swamps of Burmah to the lilt of native Christian hymns. The investments of faith are never profitless!

But, finally, let us not miss the deepest significance of Jeremiah's transaction. His buying this field, at such a time, was for him and for Jerusalem a supreme gesture of faith in the future of his people, in the future of God's purpose. For, when he bought it, the field in question was in the possession of the enemy—very probably it was even then the site of an enemy camp. It was exactly like buying a house in occupied France. But Jeremiah believed in the future. He believed, to quote his own words, 'Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Houses and fields and vineyards shall be possessed again in this land.' It was a gesture of confidence, a magnificent confession of faith, of the symbolic kind that the prophets loved, a gesture that steadied and heartened the city and encouraged his own soul, so that the cell seemed larger and the siege more remote. So was the Master's commission a gesture of faith in the future: so was Carey's sailing. And by such gestures the soul is steadied in the storm, enlarged in the prison, and freed from its terrors in the day of peril.

So we, in this European prison of darkness and pain, we look ahead in the optimism of Christian faith, and take heart.

> And not by eastern windows only,
> When daylight comes, comes in the light,
> In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
> But westward, look, the land is bright—

—Westward? No, eastward rather, eastward to China where the foundations of a Christian civilization are being laid under inspired leadership; eastward, too, to India, seeking, ever seeking, but with her face towards the light of the glory of God in the face of Christ; and southward to Africa, welcoming the gospel with an almost pathetic eagerness. Look where the lands are bright with promise: and make your gesture of faith in the future, God's future. By some act, some contribution to far-seeing enterprise, make your own affirmation of confidence, your own confession of your faith that this is God's world, and the future is with Christ.

Contributions and Comments.

The 'Ecbatic' use of ἵνα in N.T.

MATTHEW 1^{22} ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν (and so in 2^{15}). Elsewhere in this Gospel the formula is introduced by ὅπως, save once: I do not include 27^{35}, as W H eject the words. In the Fourth Gospel ἵνα is invariable in these cases. May we presume that ὅπως has the same force as ἵνα, which I take to be ecbatic, *i.e.* it implies a consequence? The words in Matthew would come to mean something like this: 'You see it all happened just in this way, so the O.T. prophecy is applicable; it is in the events of to-day that it finds its true fulfilment.' Still more important would it be if we might take the ἵνα of Mark 4^{12} (=Lk 8^{10}) in similar fashion, and not as final. In Mt 13^{13-15} the harshness of the saying attributed to Jesus in the parallel passages in Mark and

Luke (if we insist on ἵνα as final only) appears to be toned down.

This ecbatic force of ἵνα should be welcomed; it is admitted by Lightfoot in his note on Gal 5^{17}. For further examples see 1 Jn 3^{1}, where the added clause καί ἐσμεν seems to give emphasis to the result implied in the preceding words; Jn 9^{2}, where we have τίς ἥμαρτεν . . . ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ, which is surely consecutive, not final. In Rev 13^{13} it is the same. In the κοινή and later Greek the usage is fairly common; a good example occurs in Epictetus iv. 3^{9} ἐλεύθερός εἰμι καὶ φίλος Θεοῦ ἵνα ἑκὼν πείθωμαι αὐτῷ (with the result that I willingly obey him).

E. H. Blakeney.

Winchester.

Entre Nous.

The Biography of Bishop Bardsley.

Among Cyril Bardsley's many friends one of the chief was the Bishop of Sodor and Man and it is he who contributes the Foreword to the biography which has just been published (S.P.C.K.; 9s. net). The Bishop of Sodor and Man writes, 'He won my admiration many years ago by his selfless devotion to his work, he won my affection by his transparent goodness. I remember in his St. Helens' days, sitting with him until a late hour, talking over the deeper things of life, when he suddenly turned to me and said, "Do you know what is my great ambition in life?" After some hesitation I said, "No." He continued, "It is my ambition to be holy."'

The biography has been written by Miss Joan Bayldon. It will be remembered that her marriage to the Bishop had been arranged only a short time before his death. At the suggestion of his sister, Deaconess Bardsley, Miss Bayldon gave herself to the preparation of this biography, and it is a most competent and unbiased piece of work.

The story opens at Haworth where Cyril's grandfather, the Rev. James Bardsley, was one of Mr. Brontë's curates. He had seven sons all ordained in the Church of England, and it was the second son, the Rev. James Wareing Bardsley who was the father of Cyril Bardsley. In this family also all the sons entered the Church, although Cyril had at first no intention of this. Dating from an accident at a preparatory school his education was interrupted and sketchy. He spoke of himself as 'the most ignorant of the Bishops.' 'But he realized the value of the discipline that he had received, "I was very ambitious," he said to his sister, "and I might never have found God."'

After Bardsley came down from Oxford, he worked for about two years in a solicitor's office, passed his first law examination, but found little satisfaction in what he was doing. Then various influences brought him to Wycliffe Hall, where he worked happily under the Principal, the Rev. F. J. Chavasse, having at last found his vocation. His curacy and his two livings—St. Ann's, Nottingham, and St. Helens—are briefly described. In St. Helens he had a church which accommodated more than two thousand people; he had the supervision of three missions, and his band of church workers numbered over five hundred. Numbers he had but this did not satisfy him. His prayer was, 'O Lord, make this place a birthplace of souls.' To adapt words of his own, he had seen the sinfulness of sin and had known the power of Christ in his own life to overcome it. This was his experience to share, and his message to deliver, and his aim was always 'conversion.' Talking in 1940 to the last group of ordinands he said, 'How I long that none of you will ever hesitate about that word, but rather that you may have an ever-deepening understanding of it.'

After St. Helens there followed twelve strenuous years as Hon. Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. Then a period as Secretary of the Missionary Council, until in 1923 he was offered the Bishopric of Peterborough. The events of the years there (1924–1927, and at Leicester, 1927–1940) are given very fully—when the Peterborough Diocese was divided Bardsley chose to go to Leicester though this involved sacrifice. It was 'the hard job and the one with less money.' This was the last among his varied crowded spheres.

'Narrowmindedness,' says Miss Bayldon, 'intolerance and lack of charity were not characteristics of Cyril Bardsley.' It is an under statement. He had learned in his C.M.S. days that Churches had much to receive from one another. He learned also that different schools of thought in his own Church had much to receive from one another. As a Bishop a principle by which he sought to be guided was that the Church must be far wider than any particular tradition. A man must be loyal to his own convictions. Without that he cannot win respect, 'nor can he help his brethren to the full extent of his power. Without loyalty to the true comprehension of the Church, clergy and people must suffer through the narrowness of his sympathies and the limitations of his experience.'

The title of the biography is *Cyril Bardsley, Evangelist.* In his address at the last clerical convention at Swanwick in 1938 he said: 'As Chairman of the Evangelistic Committee I find myself face to face with this question, "How can there be continuous evangelism in our parishes throughout the Church of England?" I see the Spirit of Evangelism lighting up and then dying down. One brother Bishop said quite simply, "Oh, evangelism; we have done that." The same is true in many parishes. There is the danger—the

failure to understand and be gripped by the primary aim of our ministry, to bring lives into redeeming touch with Christ, and to lead our people on to lives that witness for Christ. The only answer I know is that we clergy should be more filled with the Spirit of Christ.'

Dick Sheppard.

The authoritative life of *H. R. L. Sheppard* has been written by Mr. R. Ellis Roberts (John Murray; 15s. net). No one was more competent for the task, for he was not only an intimate friend of Sheppard but understood and loved him, and moreover was in possession of material which Sheppard had preserved for an autobiography or a biography. What happened at the first meeting between the two is significant. It was a purely business interview and on Roberts' side with little expectation of liking or any kind of impression. After a short time Sheppard looked at Roberts and said 'gravely and thoughtfully,' 'I do love you, you know.' That was extraordinary, but what was just as extraordinary was the way in which this amazing outburst was received. 'I was proud, glad, humble, and somehow managed to say so.' Well, that, at any rate, was Sheppard. He gave himself to everybody with both hands, and one of the startling things about this story is the number and quality of the people whom he attracted and held as his friends, from Archbishop Lang to Max Beerbohm. George, the butler at Cuddesdon, wrote to Dick: 'I cannot remember all the thirty years at Cuddesdon have I known such a kind and thoughtful gentleman as Mr. Sheppard, God bless you, Sir, is my prayer.' Max Beerbohm said of their first meeting: 'I felt rather tired . . . but hardly had I beheld my host and exchanged greetings with him when I felt perfectly fresh and in the best of health. . . . He radiated a youthfulness that was less that of an undergraduate than of a schoolboy. Nevertheless he made me feel younger than my years. And better than my character. Generous, unselfish, altruistic (I might even have felt a little clerical, if he had seemed less signally lay). In fact I was under the wand of the enchanter. . . . It is a truism to say that he was irresistible.' There may be added to these tributes this from one of the workers at Oxford House: 'He took us as he found us, diffident, uncouth, tiresome, angular creatures that we were, and by merely living with us transformed us into a happy family, a band of brothers.'

One of Dick's characteristics was his courage. Physical courage, to begin with. And at Oxford House he needed this. His activities seriously prejudiced the publicans' takings, and some of their allies used to call on him in his bedroom to hound him out of the place. If there were only two or three of them he took them on (he boxed well). Once he was kicked into insensibility. But he went back again next week. He knew that if he didn't he need never show face again. But moral courage as well as physical—Dick's life was spent in attempting the impossible. He was always seeking perfection and was impatient of anything else. This explains the severity of his criticism of the Church, of the policy and conduct of St. Paul's Cathedral (that 'old mausoleum') when he was Canon there, and indeed of every institution with which he was connected. And nothing deterred him from taking his own way, no convention, no tradition, no high personage. When the King (who was one of his parishioners) signified his strong disapproval of Dick going to France in the last war, he went all the same, and did not forfeit the King's respect. One of his most quixotic enterprises was the attempt to turn the Scottish orgy round St. Paul's on New Year's eve into a religious service, and he nearly pulled this off! Another of his schemes was to get permission to preach peace to the German people. In furtherance of this he wrote a letter to Hitler, but, needless to say, got no reply.

Dick was for a time Dean of Canterbury and later Canon of St. Paul's. But, of course, his great ministry was the twelve years at St. Martin-in-the-Fields. All his qualities combined to make this a memorable period for himself and for thousands of others, his unconventionality, his mental fertility, his intense love of his fellow-men, his humour, his sportmanship (he was a class cricketer, a member of the M.C.C., and of I Zingari), and his power as a preacher. This power Bernard Shaw traced to the fact that he was a superb actor who could get it across. But Mr. Roberts has more insight when he says it was due to a quality that not many preachers possess—he spoke to the crowd as if he was addressing each individual in it, and they all felt that.

All this belongs to the lighter side of Dick's life. But Mr. Roberts makes it abundantly clear that there was another side. Tragedy haunted this much-loved figure. His early years were made miserable by severities both at home and in school. And as time went on ill-health was his constant portion. Behind all his light-heartedness were the agonies of asthma in an aggravated form. He spent long periods in extreme depression. He was beset by doubts as to the rightness of almost any step he took. When he did a courageous thing (taking Communion in a Presbyterian Church) he was tortured by the suspicion that he had done the wrong thing. And, worst fate of all, there was added domestic trouble. One cannot too much admire the skill and restraint with which Mr. Roberts deals with the part Dick's wife played in his life, or didn't play. Suffice it to say that here was a cloud that was never far away. It is not to be wondered at that Dick's life was one of glaring contrasts; the man who loved outrageous nonsense and loved people, and the hooded figure of gloom that stalks through these years.

The last chapter of this brilliant book is devoted to Sheppard's pacifism, first a criticism of it, which is convincing and conclusive, and then a defence of it, which is unconvincing and inconclusive. But that does not matter. Mr. Roberts had a great subject and he has done it complete justice. His picture of Dick Sheppard is full of light and love, and helps us to see him as he really was.

Notes of an Address.

'On two occasions the King encouraged us by his presence. Just before His Majesty's first visit I mislaid the notes of my short address. I had to go into the pulpit without them and my embarrassment on arriving was not diminished by spotting my manuscript where I must have dropped it, alongside the service paper which had been placed in the front pew for His Majesty's use. I have often had occasion to regret my illegible handwriting, but I think it served me well that day for the first reminder on those notes stood as follows: "Loyal and sincere gratitude to H.M., *but no soap*."'[1]

Hypocrisy.

'There is the common comparison of Dick with St. Francis of Assisi but it breaks down—right at the beginning. The whole point of Francis' life is that it was exceptional—no money, no lodging, no books, no learning. I am suspicious of much modern praise of St. Francis. Clever people, who wish to attack the Church or the ordinary, struggling Christian, laud St. Francis to the skies as the normal, typical Christian: it pleases them to relegate the Christian life to this lovely but narrow ideal of holy, impoverished ignorance. As they have no intention themselves of adopting the Christian life, it is safer to praise this extreme than to consider whether they can dismiss the Christianity of St. Thomas, or St. Ignatius, or St. Francis of Sales, or Joseph Butler, or Friedrich von Hügel, or Mandell Creighton or Charles Gore. Insist on a Christian ideal quite outside the reach of most men and women, an ideal which separates life from all art and scholarship and social life, and who can blame you for not following it? I suspect that those who insist on the Franciscan comparison are at bottom anxious to avoid in some way the claim which Dick Sheppard makes on them to live, in their degree, and in the world, the Christian life.'[2]

Fallacy of Literalism (Mt 5^{38-42}).

'The words which our Lord uses in this portion of His Sermon, such as "Resist not evil," "Give to him that asketh," are evidently set before us in their absolute form in order to induce us to use our own judgment on each occasion, whenever we endeavour to put them into practice. As St. Paul says, we ought to be, "not mentally children, but in intelligence full-grown men" (1 Co 14^{20}) . . .

'The very illustrations which He gives make the literal copying of what He tells us so rare as to be almost impossible. There is, indeed, a well-known story of John Forman, the old missionary in Lahore, who actually received a fierce blow on his right cheek when he was preaching in the bazaar from some one who had read this verse. This gave him the one opportunity he had waited for of doing exactly what His master told him. He turned with a smile his left cheek to the smiter, and won over the heart of his persecutor by doing so.

'But such a literal following of Christ's commandment is so rare as to be almost unique.

'I may be pardoned for relating an incident which happened in the midst of what might be called "rescue work" in one of the worst slums in London down at Walworth.

'One who had sunk to the lowest depths of intemperance came at midnight to the mission-house, and we took him in.

'Later the silver vessels for the communion of the sick were found to be missing. The small silver paten was recovered from a pawnshop but the rest of the silver remained unfound. Then one night I heard a heavy thud on the door outside. There on the doorstep was the same man, almost dead drunk, and I was about to take him in once more in order to put him up for the night when he put his hand in a ragged pocket and brought out the rest of the silver vessels.

'At that moment I sought for guidance as to the best thing to be done. At last I decided to do a thing I had never done before—namely, to give him into custody. So I took him round to the police station and asked the head officer, whom I knew, to take care of him. Then I went to the court the next morning and asked for a light sentence. The magistrate, who heard the whole story, helped in every way possible and gave him a month's simple imprisonment, on my guarantee to look after him when he was released. He came back to live with us. . . . He fell back once or twice, and at last became very ill. . . . We obtained his admission into the Brompton Hospital, and he lingered on for nearly two years, during which his whole character became changed. . . .

'I asked him one day whether he thought I had done the right thing that night in taking him to the police station. He said to me, "Yes, sir; that was the turning-point of my life."'[3]

Contradictions in Christ's Teaching.

'Not seldom in India I have had to answer an attack on the Christian Faith which was built up by the writer on the "Contradictions" in Christ's teaching. The argument thus used was a very foolish one, because life is never logical. . . . To standardize His sayings is to rob them of their living power.

'A humorous story may illustrate this, for it contains a wealth of wisdom behind the humour. Once I saw the answers given by the poet Tagore in one of those disconcerting autograph books which ask intimately personal questions. This one had the heading, "What is your favourite vice?" The poet had replied in his clear handwriting, "Inconsistency." The next question was, "What is your favourite virtue?" Tagore had written exactly the same word, "Inconsistency."'[4]

[1] R. Ellis Roberts, *H. R. L. Sheppard*, 100.
[2] *Ib.*, 323.
[3] C. F. Andrews, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 122.
[4] *Ib.*, 127.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.